

It would be our goal today to pay for this loss of revenue by cutting the overhead and travel budget of the Energy Department and by selling a very small part of the spectrum, something that the President has supported at a level of \$38 billion of sales, something that the Congress is on record in favor of. On a \$19 billion sale, we would have roughly a \$2 billion sale as part of this package.

If you want to bring down the price of gasoline at the pump, if you want, by Friday morning, to have every filling station in America going out, opening for business, bringing down their posted price by 4.3 cents a gallon, saving every motorist in America about \$1 when they fill up their tank, there is only one thing we can do, and that is repeal this tax on gasoline.

I hope we can do it today. I hope the House can act quickly, that the President will sign it, that we can grant relief. What a great thing it would be to do it on tax freedom day, when the average American family has worked from January 1 until today just to pay taxes.

For the first time this year, they are working for themselves. Today would be an excellent day to repeal this tax, to give relief to motorists and, in the process, let working families keep more of what they earn.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I particularly thank the Senator from Texas, who first raised this issue several weeks ago, and I thank him for his leadership. I think it would be an excellent day, since today is tax freedom day. Hopefully, we can reach an agreement here.

I think repeal of the gas tax will pass. The Senator from Texas has outlined how we pay for it—the spectrum sales, which is about \$2.5 billion in savings, and the Energy Department, about \$800 million over the next 7 years. This would repeal it through the end of this year, and the Budget Committee would then come forth with repeal thereafter.

I also add that, of course, it is tax freedom day, and a lot of people have noted that. I am not certain how many taxpayers have thought about it, but, as the Senator from Texas pointed out, tomorrow they are sort of on their own. For the first 128 days, they have been working for the local, State, and Federal Government, just to pay their taxes. That is on the average.

Since President Clinton came on board, we have added 1 week to that because of the big, big tax increase in 1993 of \$265 billion to \$268 billion. So it has already been extended. You have to work an extra week, after 3 years of President Clinton, to get to tax freedom day.

Some would say, well, 4.3 cents is not really worth it. I think that, from the standpoint of sending a signal to the

American people, we are serious about tax reduction, serious about tax freedom day. It is not just a day to make an appearance somewhere or make a statement on the Senate floor. We are serious about it.

As the Senator from Texas pointed out, this 4.3 cents is not going for highways, or bridges, or mass transit, or construction of any kind. It is going for deficit reduction. I have voted for tax increases in the past, as has been pointed out by my colleagues on the other side, to build highways and bridges. That is what we thought the fuel taxes were all about.

In 1990, for a very short period of time, we had to divide a 5-cent tax increase between the deficit and the trust fund so that we could get our colleagues on the other side to go along with the budget agreement of 1990. That would have expired at the end of 5 years. But before that expiration date occurred, the big tax bill of 1993 took that 5 cents and put it all in the trust fund, but then added 4.3 cents to deficit reduction. Therein lies the problem of today. We have a permanent 4.3 cents gas tax for deficit reduction.

The people who build highways, who travel our highways, and use mass transit can understand if you are doing it to make the highway safer, for better transportation, better highways, and mass transit, but not deficit reduction. So we need to cut taxes for the average family. We also need to go back and look at some of the things that were vetoed last year, such as the \$500-per-child tax credit, the expanded IRA's, tax relief for education expenses, estate tax relief for family businesses, marriage penalty relief, and a whole host of things we think are good incentives and should be adopted and would create jobs and opportunities.

American families—at least the ones I visit with—think they are paying enough in taxes. As I said, they are paying a lot more because of the legislation that was passed in 1993, without a Republican vote in the House or the Senate.

So today I am introducing, along with Senator GRAMM, and others, legislation repealing the 1993 gas tax hike. I am going to ask in a moment unanimous consent to bring the gas tax repeal to a vote on the taxpayer bill of rights. The taxpayer bill of rights 2 is pending at the desk. We can bring that up, offer an amendment, have 30 minutes of debate, and vote on it. It would then go to the House, and we will have repealed the 4.3-cent gas tax.

I hope we can have an agreement on this. It seems to me that we know it is going to pass. It is going to happen one of these days. It may as well happen today, as the Senator from Texas pointed out, on tax freedom day. So this would be a good day to indicate that we are serious about it.

There is some question as to whether the repeal would result in lower gas prices for consumers. On Friday, I was

in Virginia at an Exxon station with Senator WARNER, Congressman TOM DAVIS, and others, and we were assured by the owner of the station—in fact, he is the owner of several Exxon stations—that, obviously, it was their intent to pass the 4.3 cents on to consumers. That is how they do business. They know their customers, and the customers are going to know whether or not it has been passed on to them.

Our amendment is drafted to ensure that this happens by providing an immediate tax cut against other applicable excise taxes. We also require that the Departments of Justice, Treasury, and Energy study fuel prices in June, July, and August 1996, to determine whether the gas tax repeal is passed through to consumers. Those Departments would be required to report back to Congress by September 30.

We also propose a sense of the Congress that the benefits of the gas tax repeal be made immediately available to consumers. So we have listened to the concerns expressed by our colleagues. We had the same concerns. We believe the benefits will go to the consumers. Just to make certain and erase any doubt or skepticism, we have added these provisions.

Repealing the 1993 gas tax will cut driving costs for families who drive to work, to school, to worship, or on vacation. There are many reasons for the skyrocketing gas prices. Maybe they will go up. We are not suggesting that the repeal of the gas tax is going to put the halt to rising gas prices, but they will be at least 4.3 cents less. It is one way of cut driving costs for American families and businesses. I think it is something we should do, something we will do. Also, we would like to scrap—and at the appropriate time we will talk about it, later this year—the current tax system and replace it with a flatter, fairer, and simpler system that no longer discourages savings and investment, economic growth, and job creation.

So I urge my colleagues not to object, so we can get on with the work of debating this. It should not take long. It is a fairly clear-cut issue at stake. I will now propound the unanimous-consent request, and I understand the distinguished Democratic leader may have some request of his own. I propound this request.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 2337

Mr. DOLE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 374, H.R. 2337, an act to provide for increased taxpayer protections; that one amendment be in order to the measure, which will be offered by the majority leader, regarding the gas tax repeal; that no other amendments or motions be in order, other than a motion to table; further, that immediately following the disposition of the Dole-Gramm amendment, the bill be read

the third time, and the Senate proceed to passage of the measure, as amended, if amended, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, let me begin by saying that I believe this whole effort has a lot more to do with politics than the price of gasoline. We all know what is going on here. We all recognize what day it is.

We all ought to recognize, as well, that this is the first time in our recent history—perhaps in 100 years—that we have been able to reduce the deficit for 4 years in a row—4 years in a row.

So, Mr. President, we find ourselves in a situation here where, because we were able to show some courage and send the right message to the American people 4 years ago with regard to meaningful deficit reduction, now the American people are less in debt and have less difficulty visualizing ultimate success with regard to a real balanced budget than they have had in generations.

So, Mr. President, a lot of our colleagues are very concerned about what this really means. If we can find so convenient an offset, what is wrong with dedicating that offset to real deficit reduction, rather than a gesture which may or may not help the American consumer?

I reserve the right to object now because, I must tell you, I am not convinced that a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, which is all this is, with regard to ensuring that the consumer gets the benefit, is going to provide any confidence to anybody out there. We cannot accept a simple sense-of-the-Senate resolution as our only message to the American consumer that indeed they are going to benefit. With every 1-cent decrease in the tax, we are talking about a billion dollars in new profit to the oil companies.

And so, Mr. President, because we do not have that assurance, because we really think this merits some debate, I would ask that Senator DOLE's request be modified to permit other amendments to be offered from our side of the aisle. Otherwise, this will be the fifth or sixth bill to which Democrats are completely precluded from offering any amendments.

We cannot accept that. If we want to serve in the House, we ought to be in the House. If we want to serve in the Senate, we ought to have a good and open debate about this bill and all other bills that come before us. That is what the Senate process is all about.

So unless we can ensure that other amendments will be offered, then I would object, but I will offer that as a modification and ask unanimous consent.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is asking unanimous consent to modify the unanimous-consent request—

Mr. DASCHLE. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I will reserve the right to object.

First of all, if the amendment is to make certain that the savings are passed on to the consumers, I am not certain how that is going to be implemented. I cannot imagine how the Federal Government can in every case determine that in every service station in America—I do not know how many thousands there are—savings are passed on to the consumer. That might take an army of additional Federal employees.

We do require in our bill that the Department of Justice, Treasury, and Energy study fuel prices and make certain it is passed through and report back to Congress by September 30.

I assume, if we found cases of price gouging, then we could take appropriate action. I do not know how we would do it in advance, how we would monitor, police such an effort all across America. So I do not know what else—we did it to indicate our concern, too. Obviously, consumers want to get a price decrease. They are not looking for repeal of the tax and then nothing changes for the consumer.

So I say if the amendment is with reference to the gas tax, we might be able to reach some accommodation, but I assume the Senator has in mind other amendments that reach far beyond the gas tax. Is that correct?

Mr. DASCHLE. If the majority leader will yield to allow me to respond, the answer is in the affirmative. Obviously, we have attempted in good faith to offer the minimum wage amendment to a number of other bills simply because, as the minority, we do not have the opportunity to have an up-or-down vote on the minimum wage. Studies have shown that an increase in the minimum wage provide over 100 times more benefit to the consumer and to the average working family than this meager amount of tax relief will provide.

So what is wrong with having a good debate on this and other amendments? That is really the essence of the Senate. It is to have a debate about amendments, offered by the minority or the majority, to improve legislation—make it more responsive to people. We are simply trying as best we can to protect our rights in this case as we have in so many other cases. That seems to me to be the price of working through legislation on this bill and on other bills.

So, yes, it is our intention to offer the minimum wage amendment and other amendments to this bill as the current majority did when they were in the minority.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, I have thought about this a great deal. I would be prepared to go, I think, further than many of my colleagues would be prepared to go. We would call up another revenue bill—and there are some

on the calendar, I guess; H.R. 2684 comes to mind—and modify the text of that with the repeal of the gas tax and that would be considered, 1 hour of debate—I know the Senator from Massachusetts would only take 30 minutes on the minimum wage proposal; it is in the RECORD a couple of times—and then I would offer an amendment which would be the amendment discussed by the Senator from Massachusetts on minimum wage, 45 cents and then 45 cents, which would raise it from \$4.25 to \$5.15, and we would add to that the so-called TEAM Act.

So it would be repeal of the gas tax, the minimum wage proposal tendered by my colleagues on the other side, with the TEAM Act, and we would have 1 hour on that and then we would vote.

Now, that seems to me to address all the concerns raised by my colleagues on the other side. It would be the win-win that I read about over the weekend. You would have repeal of the gas tax, and you would also have the adoption of the minimum wage which would take you to \$5.15. I am not certain it could be done by July 1. It will take probably longer than that to implement the first increase, and then the second increase would take place a year from then.

So if that offer would be acceptable to the Democratic leader, it seems to me that would answer all of his concerns; it is the minimum wage proposal discussed on the other side of the aisle; it is the gas tax repeal that I think many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would vote for, and it would contain a measure reported out of the Labor Committee called the TEAM Act.

I think that might be one way to resolve this, and we would have that debate, have it this afternoon, repeal the gas tax, pass the minimum wage, and send it on to the House. We would be happy to do that at this point.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me just respond briefly, and I know the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is prepared to respond as well. We have discussed as many scenarios as the imagination will allow. This is yet another iteration.

Basically, all we have said is that we want an up-or-down, clean vote. There are a lot of scenarios that could bring that about. This is another example. Senator LOTT and I have discussed many different ways in which to do this. But we still have not been given the assurance that we could have an up-or-down vote on freestanding legislation. So if the majority leader is now proposing that as an option, not marrying the two but have them freestanding, we will consider that. That is not my understanding, however. I will yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. GRAMM. Will the distinguished majority leader yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader has the floor.

Mr. DOLE. I yield to the Senator from Texas, and then I will be happy to

yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, the tragedy of this thing is that 23 percent of this gasoline tax we are trying to repeal today is paid by families that make less than \$20,000 a year. So whatever we are going to do in the future about allowing management and employees to get together and talk about safety measures, something that I think makes perfectly good sense—I understand the National Labor Relations Board intervened and stopped companies from talking about safety clothing for pregnant women, and that is what the TEAM Act is trying to provide, to allow supervisors and workers to get together as teams—I am for that.

I know the distinguished minority leader is for raising the minimum wage. The point is we can today cut the gasoline tax by 4.3 cents a gallon, we can lower the cost of filling up your tank by the end of the week by a dollar a tank and 23 percent of those savings will go to families that make less than \$20,000 a year.

Can we not do this one thing to help the very people whom we say we are helping with these other provisions? Can we not move ahead with this one provision today and debate these other provisions tomorrow? I do not see why we want to hold this up. The American people are strongly for it. I have heard the distinguished minority leader say that he does not object. We could pass this today. The House could pass it tomorrow. The President could sign it on Thursday. And Friday morning when filling stations all over America open, the posted price could come down by 4.3 cents a gallon, saving a dollar a tank for working people.

Mr. BREAU. Will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. GRAMM. I do not control the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader controls the floor.

Mr. GRAMM. My point is that this is something that helps everybody, and 23 percent of the benefits of repealing this gasoline tax accrue to people who make \$20,000 or less. Let us help them today and then we can debate whether something else helps or hurts tomorrow.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. I just say that we would like, of course, first of all, to just pass the repeal of the gas tax today. We have the taxpayer bill of rights at the desk. We can amend that and send it back to the House, as I said earlier. I think it would be an overwhelming vote. We have it paid for. We are not going to add to the deficit. Keep in mind, this 4.3 cents does not go to highways or mass transit; it goes to deficit reduction and that is the big difference.

But in response to the indication from the distinguished Democratic

leader that they would like to offer additional amendments, it occurred to me if we are prepared to repeal the gas tax, which I think a majority of both sides are for here, and are prepared to bring up the minimum wage that the other side has talked for, but with just little amendment called a TEAM Act, we ought to be able to come together on this. Everything they want is in the package, except we have one little piece. The TEAM Act amends Federal labor laws to make clear that employers and employees may meet together in committee or other employee involvement programs to address issues of mutual interest.

Who could be opposed to that, the employers and employees sitting down and talking about issues related to quality, productivity and efficiency, as long as they do not engage in collective bargaining? Who is opposed to this? Guess. The labor bosses. When the labor bosses say, "We are opposed," it reverberates on the Senate floor.

So we are ready to, I guess, accommodate our colleagues on the other side in nearly every instance except in this one area. We would hope we could have an agreement. We could go ahead and finish this afternoon; have a couple of hours debate and pass it. If we cannot pass it, just repeal the gas tax in itself, then let us double up and repeal the gas tax, pass the minimum wage with the TEAM Act added to it, and send it on to the House. It seems to me that would be one way to satisfy concerns of Members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

Mr. DOLE. I will be happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator. I am sure the Senator is aware that the value for the average family with the 4.3-cent elimination of the gas tax, if it is passed on—and I think, as has been pointed out here, there is no guarantee it would be passed on—would be about \$28 a year. The increase in the minimum wage is \$1,800 a year, for those who are working on the bottom of the ladder. So the idea that was suggested by the Senator from Texas that "why do we not just do what we can this afternoon and leave that to future times?" is, I think, unpersuasive.

Let me ask the leader, as I understand, on the measure that is currently before the Senate, H.R. 2937, the reimbursement of the White House Travel Office employees, as I understand from the parliamentary situation, it is not in order for either the minority leader or myself to offer the minimum wage amendment on that. Am I correct on that? Am I correct?

Mr. DOLE. That is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am correct on it. Now, as I understand it, the proposal that is being put forward by the majority leader in effect would foreclose any opportunity under his unanimous consent agreement earlier to have any up-or-down vote on independent legislation with regards to the increase in the minimum wage.

Mr. DOLE. It contains the increase you suggested in the minimum wage, 45 cents and 45 cents.

Mr. KENNEDY. Just finally, I am puzzled by the need for attention—for cooperation that the Senator points out, because, under Senator KASSEBAUM's bill, under the findings, she points out that employee involvement, which operates successfully in both unionized and nonunionized settings, has been established by over 80 percent of employers, the largest employers in the United States, and exists in 30,000 workplaces.

That is already in effect at the present time, according to Senator KASSEBAUM's findings. In her report it says the survey found that 75 percent of responding employers, large and small, incorporate some means of employee involvement in their operations. Among larger employers, where there are about 5,000 or more employees, the percentage was at 96 percent.

So I am just wondering, while many of us wonder about the wisdom of putting in the law another piece of legislation that is unnecessary, why we ought to confuse that with the proposal of an increase in the minimum wage which the overwhelming majority of the American people support, and, in fact, the leader himself has supported four out of four times—opposed it eight times in the past but has voted in favor of it in the past, and obviously thought it was meritorious then. Why should we wait for an early resolution of that issue, rather than to follow the suggestions of the leader? Is the leader telling us that is the only way we are going to have an opportunity to address this issue?

Mr. DOLE. If the Senator will yield, I guess it is the other way around. Your leader is telling us the only way we can move the Senate on anything is to vote on your version of the minimum wage.

We have a majority in this body. We have some responsibility to advance legislation, and there is a lot of it on the calendar we would like to advance, including reconsideration of the constitutional amendment for a balanced budget and other matters that have a great impact. We have tried to work it out in discussion. Maybe I understand why it cannot be worked out. But it seems to me we have now suggested—if we cannot do it today just with my first request, then I am prepared to make a second request that would deal both with the minimum wage and the TEAM Act and the gas tax repeal.

The TEAM Act, we are advised by the committee that it is necessary because of the 1992 National Labor Relations Board decision. I do not see what is wrong with employers talking to employees, but the unions do not like it. The labor bosses do not want their people talking to anybody in management. So they have sent the word down we cannot have this, and if we have to filibuster this, we will filibuster this.

The facts were pointed out by the Senator from Massachusetts—what difference does it make if we have it codified? So we are prepared to take it up right now and pass the bill. But if my colleagues on the other side want to filibuster their minimum wage proposal and repeal of the gas tax, then they certainly are going to have that opportunity starting tomorrow.

Mr. KENNEDY. Reserving right to object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader has the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the floor.

Mr. DOLE. I will be happy to yield to my colleague, the Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I admire the majority leader a great deal, as he knows. We all know what he is trying to do.

We all know that the President, for good reason, opposes the TEAM Act, especially in its current form. Why? Because it gives license to companies to set up rump organizations to negotiate with themselves. That is what this is all about. This is not talking to employees. As the Senator from Massachusetts has indicated, they can do that right now. What they cannot do is set up rump organizations to negotiate with themselves and claim some new victory here. That is what this is all about.

So that is what I said earlier, if you will recall. I said if the distinguished majority leader is prepared to separate the issues, the TEAM Act and minimum wage, so we are not amending a bill that is going nowhere, we will take a look at that. But that is not what I understood to be the suggestion here.

So, again, as I said, we want to be real here. If we can be real—if we can come up with a scenario that we know will really work—then we are prepared to negotiate in good faith and come to some resolution here. But to add this amendment to a bill that the distinguished leader knows is going nowhere is not a deal at all.

Mr. KENNEDY. Reserving the right to object, will the Senator yield for one moment?

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am rather new at this, but it seems to me, when you get what you want plus you get a little icing on the cake, you get to vote to repeal the gas tax, you ought to take it. But now we are told—I did not know the President was opposed to this. I thought certainly he would be flexible on something like this. He probably is. But I know the labor unions have been in town and they dumped \$35 million into different races, and they have certain priorities. I thought their priority was passing a minimum wage increase, not killing the TEAM Act, which is really minor. It is minor legislation.

So here we are prepared—I will probably get a lot of criticism on this side for doing this, but I am prepared to

make this very generous offer to give my colleagues on the other side of the aisle a chance to vote to repeal the gas tax and to have their minimum wage proposal adopted. Who could be opposed to that? All we ask for is just one small, one little amendment. It probably would be hardly noticed by anybody. It simply says that employees can talk to management. They can talk about—in one case, they were talking about no smoking policies, and that was a violation of the NLRB. It seems to me we need to have a little common sense enter this debate.

I have listened. I have been persuaded by the Senator from Massachusetts we ought to take 30 minutes and pass a minimum wage, and we can add another 30 minutes for the repeal of the gas tax. Then we will put in 10 minutes for this little, tiny piece that nobody really cares about called the TEAM Act. Then we would have a package that we could all be proud of and we could accommodate the concerns of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—I hope. I have discussed this with the majority whip. I think he is willing. I think my other colleagues may not be so willing, but they are prepared to accept this procedure if we can only convince our friends on the other side that we are now willing to give them what they want if they will just say yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will simply state—

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the majority leader yield for a brief intervention for one question?

Mr. DOLE. I will be happy to.

Mr. KENNEDY. I would urge my leader to accept that proposal if the Senator would be willing to say that the workers will be selected by the employees rather than by the boss of the company. If you want to add that, I urge we move on ahead and get on with the business. That seems to me to be reasonable, that those who are going to represent workers will be selected by workers instead of the company. If the majority leader wants to make that as an amendment to give support to the TEAM Act, I urge we accept that this afternoon.

Mr. DOLE. The bill already ensures workers will retain the right to choose an independent union in the case of collective bargaining. I will be happy to consult my colleague, Senator KASSEBAUM, chairman of the Labor Committee, and run that by her and see what she thinks of it. I have not discussed that. I hope we will not scuttle this whole package over some little modification that may or may not be necessary.

So we are prepared now, or a half hour from now, to proceed, and I know my colleague from South Dakota—I guess maybe to clear up the present point, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are two unanimous-consent requests pending.

Mr. DOLE. I object.

Mr. DASCHLE. And I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to both, and the majority leader has the floor.

Mr. BREAU. Will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. DOLE. I will.

Mr. BREAU. I want to ask a question. It is a legitimate question. If we can all—almost all can—agree that the minimum wage increase is a good idea, the repeal of the gas tax is a good idea, and the passage of the TEAM legislation, as the majority leader described it, is a good idea, why should we not just take these up separately, debate them separately and vote on them separately? The ones that are good will pass, and the ones not good will not pass. What is wrong with doing them separately?

Mr. DOLE. Let me make it clear, some of my colleagues do not think minimum wage is a good idea. I read some of your colleagues feel the repeal of the gas tax is not a good idea and some of your colleagues feel the TEAM Act is not a good idea. So if you put them all together, it is not quite the good idea as taking them up separately, but when they are together, it becomes a fair idea that will get us enough votes to pass.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DOLE. I will be happy to yield to my colleague.

Mr. DASCHLE. I will wait until the majority leader is finished.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, as I understand, everything has been objected to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOLE. So where are we?

#### WHITE HOUSE TRAVEL OFFICE LEGISLATION

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. H.R. 2937 is the business.

Mr. DOLE. That is the Billy Dale legislation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Massachusetts, we can arrange to modify, chop a limb off the tree here, if we can agree on an amendment process.

Mr. KENNEDY. Why do we not just accept the pending amendment, which will open up the slot, and let us offer the minimum wage?

Mr. DOLE. We could not do that, but I think we can work out something. If you would rather have it on the Billy Dale travel matter just by itself, we can probably accommodate. But based on what the Senator from Massachusetts indicated—and I think we are closer maybe than we have been—I am going to ask the majority whip if he would visit with the Senator from Massachusetts. Let me again indicate, I did not think we would be rejected when